REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated April 15, 2008 ("*Office Action*"). Claims 1-18 and 20 are pending and stand rejected. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 9, and 14-17. Applicants have added new Claims 21-32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

I.   The Claims are Allowable Over the Proposed *Khan-Arcuri* Combination

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0018078 A1 to Khan et al. ("*Khan*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,792,475 B1 to Arcuri et al. ("*Arcuri*") and U.S. Patent No. 7,085,994 B2 issued to Gvily ("*Gvily*"). Certain claim elements of dependent Claims 18 and 20 have been incorporated into independent Claims 1 and 9, respectively. Claims 18 and 20 have been cancelled. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-17.

A.   The proposed *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination is improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the disclosure of *Gvily* with the disclosures of *Khan* and *Arcuri*. In the *Final Office Action*, the Examiner relies on *Khan* for disclosure of the receiving a user selection of a web element, on *Arcuri* for disclosure of the selection being from a list of HTML tags in the form of a tree structure, and on *Gvily* for disclosure that the web element is a HTML. With regard to *Gvily*, the Examiner states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from *Gvily* that the web elements are HTML tags." (*Final Office Action*, page 5). However, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the disclosure of *Gvily* with the disclosure of *Khan* to result in Applicants' claims. For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the disclosure of *Gvily* with the disclosure of *Khan* to result in Applicants' steps of "receiving a user selection of at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags," as recited in Claim 1.

Gvily discloses that "[a] typical HTML page 420 contains hundreds of HTML elements resulting in a large DOM hierarchy tree that is difficult at best to navigate by the average user." (*Gvily*, Column 7, lines 63-67). Even with the "simple" HTML page 1104 illustrated in Figure 11, *Gvily* discloses that "[n]avigating the DOM hierarchy tree 1112 downwards from the root is difficult since the user would have to start at BODY, then select between branches B or I, the choice of which might not be apparent from the HTML page 1104 as displayed." (*Gvily*, Column 8, lines 6-14). Accordingly, *Gvily* discloses that "a user can visually select a row of a table with a control 1204 to identify a selected element and a slider 1208 will present the user with the ability to select larger and larger logical units that contain the selected row." (*Gvily*, Column 8, lines 15-20). However, the user selection is from the HTML page 1104. The user selection is not from the DOM. Because *Gvily* actually teaches that a DOM hierarchy tree is unwieldy and difficult to navigate and presents an alternative method to selecting the scope of an item within a web page, *Gvily* actually teaches away from a user selecting an item from the DOM hierarchy tree. For at least these reasons, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the DOM hierarchy tree of *Gvily* with the web page selection mechanism of *Khan* to result in Applicants' step of "receiving a user selection of at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags," as recited in Claim 1. *Gvily* actually teaches away from such a combination of claim elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination is improper.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-17.

B.   Applicants' Claims are allowable over the proposed *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* Combination

Independent Claim 1 of the present Application, as amended, recites:

> A method for defining a composite web page, comprising:
> identifying a web page;
> parsing source code of the web page to determine a list of HTML
> tags, each HTML tag corresponding to a particular portion of the content
> of the identified web page;

presenting the determined list of HTML tags to a user in a navigation pane, the navigation pane presenting the determined list of HTML tags in the form of a tree structure that provides a visual representation of relationships between the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page, the navigation pane operable to allow the user to view and select one or more of the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page from the determined list of HTML tags;

receiving a user selection of at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags in the form of the tree structure;

in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection; and

registering the user selection of the at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags.

Because the cited references, even when considered in combination, do not disclose the combination of elements recited above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is allowable over the proposed *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination. Applicants submit that independent Claims 9 and 14-17 are allowable for analogous reasons.

For example, the proposed *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *"in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection,"* as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Thus, Applicants claim recites presenting a portion of a web page in response to a user selection of an HTML tag. In the *Final Office Action*, the Examiner relies upon *Khan* for user selection of a web element, on *Arcuri* for disclosure of the preview pane, and on *Gvily* for disclosure of the HTML tag. Thus, the Examiner relies on three distinct references for the disclosure of one step of Applicants' claim. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that such a piecemeal rejection of Applicants' claim fails to give credence to the overall combination of features recited in the Applicants' Claim 1.

Both *Khan* and *Gvily* relate to an interface that enables a user to select a portion of a HTML webpage. Specifically, *Khan* discloses a management interface that "allows a user to select and manage information that is displayed on an information screen and viewed by the user." (*Khan*, page 5, paragraph 73). Specifically, *Khan* discloses that "such things as portions of web pages, links to web pages, images, active graphics, audio content or any other type of information" may be selected and marked by the user. (*Khan*, page 5, paragraph 73). *Gvily* similarly discloses "a browser user can select portions or all of an HTML page, being browsed and construct a portal snippet from the selection." (*Gvily*, Column 5, lines 10-13). In neither system is an HTML tag selected. Rather, portions of the web pages are selected (i.e., a column in a table in *Gvily*). Although *Arcuri* discloses a navigation pane and a page view, *Arcuri* does not cure the deficiencies identified above. (*Arcuri*, Figures 4 and 5). Rather, *Arcuri* merely discloses that the navigation view 402 graphically displays "HTML files and the link bars." (*Arcuri*, Column 7, lines 46-48). Although the HTML files are hierarchically displayed, the HTML files merely correspond with a hyperlink to a web page. The HTML files are not an HTML tag corresponding with a particular portion of content on an identified web page. Thus, no reference cited by the Examiner enables a user to select an HTML tag from a hierarchical list.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' step of "*in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection*," as recited in Applicants' Claim 1, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the cited references. This is evidenced by the fact that no reference identified by the Examiner allows a user to select an HTML tag from a hierarchical list. The nonobviousness of Applicants' claim elements are further evidenced by *Gvily*, which identifies that a DOM hierarchy tree is unwieldy and difficult to navigate. Accordingly, *Gvily* presents an alternative method to selecting the scope of an item within a web page rather than the DOM hierarchy tree. The inconsistencies in *Gvily* and *Khan* with Applicants' recited claim language indicates that the Examiner's reconstruction of Applicants' claims using impermissible hindsight to piece together disjointed portions of analogous, but inconsistent references.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the disclosure of *Gvily* with the disclosure of *Khan* to result in Applicants' step of *"in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection,"* as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1, together with Claims 2-8 and 18 that depend on Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 9 and 14-17, together with Claims 10-13 and 20 that depend on Claim 9.

II.   New Claims 21-32 are Allowable Over the Cited References

New Claims 21-32 have been added and are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added. New Claims 21-22, 23-24, 25-26, 27-28, 29-30, and 31-32 depend upon independent Claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 16, and 17, respectively. Claims 21-32 are allowable over the cited references because Claims 21-32 include the limitations of their respective independent claims and add additional elements that further distinguish the art.

For example, Claim 21 recites that "using stored user instructions to determine the placement of the selected elements in the composite webpage" and "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page, the identified portion placed according to the user instructions." Claims 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 recite certain analogous limitations. This combination of features is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record.

In the *Office Action* and with regard to Claim 9, specifically, the Examiner relies on *Khan* for disclosure of "rendering the at least one element to form the composite web page." However, *Khan* merely discloses an interface "which allows a user to select and manage information that is displayed on an information screen . . . [that] can be a web page or any other content source." (*Khan*, page 1, paragraph 7). *Khan* further discloses that "the

information screen may include a potential plurality of different pages or "views." (*Khan*, Page 1, paragraph 8). However, *Khan* only discloses that "[e]ach view may contain at least one section or a 'window' for displaying the marked information" and "the user may be allowed to select, maximize, minimize, refresh and edit the content of the window." (*Khan*, Page 6, paragraph 75). Specifically, "each particular window contains hyperlinks that have been selected by the user from web-sites of his/her choice." (*Khan*, Page 6, paragraph 80). Thus, a user is able to customize the views by selecting the hyperlinks that will be displayed there. There is no disclosure in *Khan*, however, of "using stored user instructions to determine *the placement of the selected elements* in the composite webpage" and "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page, *the identified portion placed according to the user instructions*," as recited in Claim 21 and analogously recited in Claims 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31. Because *Arcuri* and *Gvily* do not cure the deficiencies identified in *Khan*, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 are allowable over the *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination.

As further examples, Claim 22 recites that "storing the user selection of the at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags on a remote server" and "enabling the display of the composite web page on any Internet-enabled any computer that the user is operating." Claims 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 recite certain analogous limitations. This combination of features is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record.

With respect to the information marked by the user, *Khan* merely discloses "such marked information is stored for subsequent retrieval in operation 212." (*Khan*, Page 6, paragraph 74). There is no disclosure, however, of where the information is stored. Further, *Khan* discloses that "a user [is allowed] to select and manage information that is displayed on an information screen and viewed by the user." (*Khan*, Page 5, paragraph 73). *Khan* further discloses that "[t]he marked information can be output to the user via the information screen." (*Khan*, Page 6, paragraph 74). The information screen referred to for selecting and then displaying the information a display device of a user, such as display device 138. (*Khan*, Figure 1). There is no disclosure in *Khan*, however, of "storing the user selection of the at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags *on a remote server*" and "enabling the display of the composite web page *on any Internet-enabled any computer that*

the user is operating," as recited in Claim 22 and analogously recited in Claims 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32. Because *Arcuri* and *Gvily* do not cure the deficiencies identified in *Khan*, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 are allowable over the *Khan-Arcuri-Gvily* combination.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new Claims 21-32.

III.   No Waiver

All of Applicants' arguments and amendments are without prejudice and disclaimer. Additionally, Applicants have merely discussed example reasons for allowability sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicants reserve the right to discuss additional reasons for allowance, such as additional distinctions over the references cited, the improper combination of the cited references, or the improper use of one or more references as prior art, in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Jenni R. Moen, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6809.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge $550.00 to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. for additional dependent claims. Applicants believe no other fee is due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Jenni R. Moen
Reg. No. 52,038

Date: June 10, 2008

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.   **05073**